DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 680 FL 003 688

AUTHOR	Hartmann, Reinhard, Ed.
TITLE	The BAAL Seminar on German Applied Linguistics: Final Report.
INSTITUTION	British Association for Applied Linguistics.
PUB DATE	27 Mar 72
NOTE	13p.; Seminar held at the University of Nottingham, England, March 24-26, 1972
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Abstracts; *Applied Linguistics; Deep Structure; *Descriptive Linguistics; English; *German; Intonation; *Language Instruction; Language Research; Lexicography; Linguistic Theory; Models; Reports; Second Language Learning; Semantics; *Seminars; Syntax; Techniques; Vocabulary Development

ABSTRACT

This document includes the abstracts of papers presented at a seminar intended to provide a survey of how the models and techniques of linguistics may be applied to the description of the German language, with a view to improving the understanding of some of the practical problems of first and second language learning. Topics range over a wide variety of related fields from the contrast between German and English intonation patterns and their study beginning from the mid-1850's to an approach for the classification of dictionary entries, considering syntactic and semantic criteria. Other issues in applied linguistic theory and language instruction are also represented. (VM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 072680

27 March 1972

THE BAAL SEMINAR ON GERMAN APPLIED LINGUISTICS

University of Nottingham, 24-26 March 1972

FINAL REPORT

It had been the aim of this seminar "to provide a survey of how the models and techniques of linguistics may be applied to the description of the German language, with a view of improving our understanding of some of the practical problems of first and second language learning" (from the First Circular, July 1971).

There were 50 resident and a few non-resident members of the seminar. At least 8, including 3 of the 9 speakers, had come from abroad. Approximately 40 additional enquiries and preliminary applications had been received, many of which had to be turned down after the dead-line for bookings on 1st February 1972.

Almost all speakers provided abstracts of their papers in advance and distributed handouts for their talks at the meetings. The following topics were discussed:

(1) Dr. L. Seiffert (U Brimingham) presented a survey of German philology and linguistics 'from Grimm to Bierwisch' which traced several traditions of phonological, grammatical and lexical studies in two parts; one, the historical-comparative paradigm and two, synchronic grammar models.

(2) Mr. J. Trim (U Cambridge) contrasted German and English intonation patterns and their study from the mid-1850's to the present day, listing and illustrating basic similarities and differences under several headings.

(3) Dr. B. Engelen (PH Heidelberg) started his discussion of the linguistic and didactic relevance of a 'dependency' grammar of German by emphasising the crucial role of the verb in the sentence. From a surface-based distributional analysis of different sentence patterns he was led to interrelationships between syntactic form and semantic meaning of classes of verbs, 'abstracta' and certain adjectives.

(4) Mr. R. Strauch (U York) gave a tentative exploration of the semantic and syntactic relationships of quantifier constructions in German within a logical and TG framework.

B 9 8 4

ED 072680

PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

27 March 1972

THE BAAL SEMINAR ON GERMAN APPLIED LINGUISTICS

University of Nottingham, 24-26 March 1972

FINAL REPORT

It had been the aim of this seminar "to provide a survey of how the models and techniques of linguistics may be applied to the description of the German language, with a view of improving our understanding of some of the practical problems of first and second language learning" (from the First Circular, July 1971).

There were 50 resident and a few non-resident members of the seminar. At least 8, including 3 of the 9 speakers, had come from abroad. Approximately 40 additional enquiries and preliminary applications had been received, many of which had to be turned down after the dead-line for bookings on 1st February 1972.

Almost all speakers provided abstracts of their papers in advance and distributed handouts for their talks at the meetings. The following topics were discussed:

(1) Dr. L. Seiffert (U Brimingham) presented a survey of German philology and linguistics 'from Grimm to Bierwisch' which traced several traditions of phonological, grammatical and lexical studies in two parts; one, the historical-comparative paradigm and two, synchronic grammar models.

(2) Mr. J. Trim (U Cambridge) contrasted German and English intonation patterns and their study from the mid-1850's to the present day, listing and illustrating basic similarities and differences under several headings.

(3) Dr. B. Engelen (PH Heidelberg) started his discussion of the linguistic and didactic relevance of a 'dependency' grammar of German by emphasising the crucial role of the verb in the sentence. From a surface-based distributional analysis of different sentence patterns he was led to interrelationships between syntactic form and semantic meaning of classes of verbs, 'abstracta' and certain adjectives.

(4) Mr. R. Strauch (U York) gave a tentative exploration of the semantic and syntactic relationships of quantifier constructions in German within a logical and TG framework.

(5) Dr. G. Wahrig (Wiesbaden) illustrated his approach to the classification of dictionary entries with reference to the adjective 'hell'. The syntactic and semantic criteria, e.g. kernel sentences and semantic constituents, were said to be valid both for lexical description and the teaching of vocabulary.

FL003984

(6) Dr. N. Denison (L E) questioned the usefulness of the notion of 'deep structure' in the light of L1 and L2 language teaching experience, supported by contrastive studies and error analysis of interference.

(7) Mr. B. Gomes da Costa (PE London Poly) reported on the difficulties he had encountered, using standardised American tests, in his empirical research into proficiency levels reached by British undergraduate students of German.

(8) Mr. L. Götze (Goethe-Institut München) discussed theoretical and practical problems of 'didacticising' the results of linguistic research, with special reference to the concept of 'Satzbaupläne'.

(9) Mr. C. Butler (U Nottingham) reviewed recent work on the descri tion of technical registers in German under the headings of stylistic, lexical and syntactic studies and drew on his own work on the design of a German course for chemistry students.

Many participants (most of whom are in higher education, cf. List) told me that they had derived great benefit from the proceedings, which had included an exhibition of relevant books and periodicals (cf. List), co-sponsored by the Goethe-Institut. Accommodation and meals at a hall of residence also proved satisfactory.

I think it is fair to report that the objective of the seminar has been successfully achieved. I am hopeful that the proceedings which were recorded will in due course be published in book-form.

Reinhard Hartmann

CONTRASTING THE INTONATION SYSTEMS OF ENGLISH AND GERMAN

ABSTRACT

J. L. M. TRIM

The intonations of German and English are closely related, with a restricted number of points of difference which may nevertheless lead to significant misunderstandings. It is necessary (though by no means easy in practice) to distinguish paralinguistic mechanisms, which involve matched continua, from linguistic mechanisms which are quantized and structure-dependent, and their realisations. Paralinguistic features may be relatively natural or conventional, though apparently in no case totally arbitrary. Highly conventional features vary more widely than relatively natural ones, though in the latter case, the normal values may be displaced.

Closely comparable procedures for the ascription of a tonetic stress-marking (Kingdom 1958, Trim 1964) can be set up for German and English, which if applied to texts yield acceptable readings and a reliable prediction of learners' errors.

A principal area of difference lies in the extensive use of final rising (including falling-rising) intonations in English. Tentative suggestions are made for treating these as cases of late deletion and re-ordering, and the pedagogic implications for the development of learning materials (in both directions) are discussed.

A) Similarities:

i) Segmentation of texts into tone groups without residue.
ii) Distinction between major and minor tone groups.
iii) Ascription of lexical and sentence stress in relation to constituent structure.
iv) Distinction of prominent and non-prominent stress.
v) Use of final prominent (nuclear) tones as characterisers.
vi) Use of falling tone as completive.
vii) Use of rising tone as continuative.
viii) Relation of stress to focus and presupposition.

B) Differences:

i) Place of lexical stress in cognates (esp. classical loans).
ii) Distribution and intensity of prominent and non-prominent stress in compounds and phrases.
iii) Size of tone-groups in relation to tempo.
iv) the 'foot' in relation to rhythm.
v) Role of final rising and falling-rising intonations.

L. Götze (Goethe-Institut, München-Mannheim): Zur didaktischen Auswertung linguistischer Monographien. Relevanz der 'Satzbaupläne' aus didaktischer Sicht (Abstract)

Das Forschungsunternehmen 'Grundstrukturen der deutschen Sprache' wird in Zusammenarbeit zwischen dem Institut für deutsche Sprache in Mannheim und seiner Außenstelle in Freiburg auf der einen und dem Goethe-Institut München e.V. auf der anderen Seite durchgeführt. Die zweite Arbeitsphase dieses Unternehmens beinhaltet die 'didaktische Auswertung' (Arbeitstitel) der vorliegenden oder sich im Zustand der Endredaktion befindlichen linguistischen Monographien durch Mitarbeiter des Goethe-Instituts. Themen sind u.a.: 'Passiv', 'Konjunktiv', 'Wortstellung im heutigen Deutsch', 'Die deutschen Satzbaupläne' u.a.

Adressaten dieser didaktischen Monographien sind in erster Linie die Autoren von Unterrichtsmaterialien des Faches Deutsch als Fremdsprache, daneben - indirekt - auch die Pädagogen, die im genannten Bereich arbeiten, sowie Studenten der höheren Stufen. Im Referat soll der didaktische Ausgangspunkt bei der Behandlung der 'Satzbaupläne' im Deutschunterricht an Ausländer, differenziert nach Unterrichtsziel (Lernziel) und Unterrichtsstufe, aufgezeigt werden. Es geht insbesondere darum zu zeigen, daß die Beschreibung syntaktischer Verträglichkeiten mit Hilfe eines dazu geeigneten Lexikons lediglich im Anfängerunterricht - und auch hier nur bedingt - von Nutzen sein kann, daß es hingegen für den Fortgeschrittenenunterricht darauf ankommt, das lexikalische Material danach zu gruppieren, wie es geeignet ist, aufgrund seines semantischen Gehalts bestimmte Redekonstellationstypen zu erfüllen oder Aussagen über Geschehensweisen zu machen. Die Beschreibung der möglichen Leerstellenbesetzungen ohne Bezug auf einen konkreten Text ist für den Sprachunterricht nicht vorteilhaft.

C.S. Butler (Language Centre, U of Nottingham): A review of some recent work on the description of technical registers in German (Abstract)

Recent studies on the description of technical registers (Fachsprachen) of German are reviewed under three headings: stylistic, lexical and syntactic. These studies describe some of the means by which technical language may achieve the twin aims of exactness and economy.

Beneš has proposed a typology of scientific writing, based on the Prague school concept of functional styles, as elaborated by Havránek. The criteria for classification include topic, the relationship between style and audience, the communication medium and the form of presentation.

A useful basis for the orientation of lexical studies is a three-level model of vocabulary structure such as that developed by the CREDIF team, and applied to German technical registers by

Benes. The three levels are: words common to all registers; general scientific words; and special scientific words peculiar to a particular discipline or sub-discipline. Some evidence for the validity of a distinction between words common to various academic disciplines and words associated predominatly with one area of knowledge can be adduced from a study of the verb frequency list compiled by Kopps and Münster for a corpus of texts from the areas of natural science, social science and the humanities. The verb list for natural science is compared with a more restricted list compiled by Baumbach for textbooks of anatomy.

Other aspects of lexis reviewed include the work of Hoffmann on the application of general vocabulary 'laws' to scientific texts, and the studies of Reinhardt on word formation in technical registers, with particular reference to verbal prefixes.

Benes' description of the syntactic structure of scientific texts shows how the aims of exactness and economy of expression are reflected in the preferred use of certain constructions, including nominalisations and the passive voice. The prepositional group, a structure of major importance in technical texts, has been investigated for the fields of physics and chemistry by Kempter, whose work is discussed. Work at the University of Nottingham on the description of syntax in German chemical texts, at present at a very early stage, is described briefly.

N. Denison (Dept. of Language Studies, London School of Economics):
Contrastive Analysis and German Language Teaching. How Useful is Deep Structure? (Abstract)

The so-called structural theory of linguistics (pre-Chomsky) was applied to contrastive analysis of L1 and L2 'at the surface'. It was implicit in the approach that L2 learning was essentially a different process from L1 learning, and that 'interference' was inevitable. The older the learner, the greater the 'interference'. The main function of contrastive analysis was to provide a structural rather than an ad-hoc diagnosis and remedy for interference, the assumption being that interference-induced errors constituted an important proportion of those made or to be expected.

Post-Chomsky linguistics has given rise to a different approach, which sees the similarities between L1 and L2 language-learning as more significant for L2 language-teaching than the differences. The 'deep-structure' notion allied to the concept of innateness and universality has led some 'applied linguists' to operate within a framework of transformations from underlying common structure.

This more recent standpoint is critically examined against the background of earlier assumptions with English and German as illustrative material.

G. Wahrig (Mainz-Wiesbaden): German Lexicography and the Teaching of Vocabulary (Abstract)

This contribution deals with the possibilities of teaching semantic structures of lexical units. Three examples of dictionary entries -- two for the German adjective 'hell' and one for the English near-correspondent 'bright' -- stand for three types of dictionary entries: the first is based on grammar (syntax) only, the other two on an intuitive semantic analysis. Number two gives a wide range of contextual words, whereas the analysis of number three is restricted to definitions of different meanings.

The user of a dictionary with many citations or locutions (types 1 and 2) from original text or discourse will more likely find the right word in the right place than the user of a dictionary which gives definitions only (type 3).

The author wants to show that on the basis of a transformational grammar with the possibility of kernel transformations on the one hand and generative semantics based on semantic constituents on the other hand, we are able to find objective and verifiable criteria for the semantic description of words in a dictionary. These criteria would also be valid for the teaching of vocabulary.

The necessary steps in this procedure are being shown by an integrated grammatical and semantic description of the German adjective 'hell'.

B. Engelen (PH Heidelberg): Über die linguistische und didaktische Tragweite einer Dependenzgrammatik des Deutschen (Abstract)

Die Dependenzgrammatik geht bei der Beschreibung der Syntax einer Sprache von denjenigen Elementen des Satzes aus, die möglichst zahlreiche Beziehungen zu anderen Elementen des betreffenden Satzes haben. Als derartiges hervorgehobenes Element wird vor allem das Verb betrachtet (das Vollverb, nicht ein Verb des Auxiliarkomplexes). Das Ausgehen von solchen hervorgehobenen Elementen ist lediglich eine Beschreibungsstrategie und sagt noch nichts über eine Hierarchie aus.

Die Dependenzgrammatik arbeitet von der Oberflächenstruktur und dem ihr zugeordneten Inhalt aus. Jedes Lexem bzw. jede Sequenz wird immer als Komplex von Ausdruck und Inhalt gesehen, nie als Ausdruck allein. Eine explizite Tiefenstruktur etwa im Sinne der TG braucht nicht angesetzt zu werden. Beim Ausgehen vom Verb (bzw. auf einer anderen Ebene vom Abstraktum oder vom Adjektiv) können vor allem folgende Gegebenheiten ohne weiteres erfaßt und relativ leicht beschrieben werden:

(a) die bei diesem Verb möglichen Objektkasus, Direktionalia, Gleichgrößen und Artergänzungen,
(b) die mögliche Form der Objektkasus, und zwar
    (i) ob sie die Form einer Nominalgruppe haben müssen oder ob sie auch die Form eines Gliedsatzes haben können, und, wenn ja, welcher Art dieser Gliedsatz sein kann (Infinitivgruppe, daß-Satz, ob- oder w-Satz, Gliedsatz mit der Satzgliedfolge eines sog. Hauptsatzes),
    (ii) die inhaltlichen Restriktionen dieser Satzglieder,
(c) mögliche Erweiterungen des betreffenden Satzes um adverbartige Elemente wie sehr, ausgezeichnet, vollkommen, gern, sorgfältig usw.,
(d) bestimmte Transformationsmöglichkeiten, vor allem Passivtransformation und Nominalisierungstransformationen,
(e) bestimmte Präfigierungs- und Wortbildungsmöglichkeiten (im Sinne der traditionellen Grammatik).

Mittels einer Dependenzgrammatik kann leicht nachgewiesen werden, daß es bei Verb, Abstraktum und bei einem Teilbereich der Adjektive ziemlich weitreichende Interrelationen zwischen Ausdrucksseite und Inhaltsseite der Sprache gibt (hierfür werden einige Beispiele gebracht).

Zur didaktischen Tragweite einer Dependenzgrammatik:
Die Morphologie, ein Teil der Gliedfolgeregeln und die Textkonstitution sind in dem von mir vorgeschlagenen Modell nicht eingebaut, können aber ohne weiteres integriert werden. Komplexere Nominalgruppen hingegen sind erfaßt. Nicht geeignet ist dieses Modell für die Beschreibung von Äußerungen, die nicht Verbalsätze oder ohne weiteres aus solchen reduzierbar sind, und für lexikalisierte Wendungen.

Für den Anfängerunterricht ist die Dependenzgrammatik nicht unbedingt besser geeignet als der traditionelle Fremdsprachenunterricht, aber wahrscheinlich besser als transformationelle Ansätze. Beim Unterricht für Fortgeschrittene hingegen dürfte ein Dependenzmodell einige Vorteile bieten, vor allem:

(a) Die in der Umgebung eines bestimmten Verbs möglichen Strukturen können vollständig erfaßt werden.

(b) Diese möglichen Strukturen sind nicht einzelnen Verben zugeordnet, sondern normalerweise Gruppen von Verben. Der Lernaufwand wird hierdurch unter Umständen erheblich verringert.

(c) Als Mitglieder einer Gruppe (die eine Art Wortfeld bildet) können die einzelnen Verben besser inhaltlich voneinander differenziert werden als einzelne Lexeme ohne Berücksichtigung ihrer 'Feldnachbarn'.

R.O.U. Strauch (Dept. of Language, U of York): Between Syntax and Semantics in German. Remarks on Quantifiers (Abstract)

The purpose of this paper is to examine, from a linguistic point of view, the general patterns of quantifier constructions in German. An attempt is made to state explicitly the intuitively perceived relationships between constructions like viel Geld, viele Bücher, ein Haufen Geld(es), eine Menge (von) Bücher(n), einige Bemerkungen, manche Äusserungen, etc. An account of the systematic processes underlying these and similar constructions (particularly those containing all and jed) must also deal with the question of semantic representation of quantifiers, but in the framework of this paper only first, tentative suggestions can be given for the type of semantic representation needed.

The syntactic properties of sentences containing quantifiers are examined in slightly greater detail. While the question of whether or not quantifiers should be taken as higher predicates in the underlying structure depends largely on the type of grammatical model chosen, it will be argued that the analysis of quantifiers as Pre-Determiners cannot be upheld. Recent research in this field (e.g. by Lakoff, Jackendoff, etc.) will have to be taken into account, but the emphasis in this paper is on demonstrating the linguistic processes involved rather than elaborating on the technical details of the description.

L. Seiffert (Dept. of German, U of Birmingham): German Linguistics from Grimm to Bierwisch (Abstract)

The starting point for this survey is the formation of the historicist paradigm in linguistics - elaborated, after two generations for whom J. Grimm and A. Schleicher may stand as representative names - by an international group in which G. Ascoli, K. Brugmann, A. Leskien, H. Osthoff, H. Paul, F. de Saussure, V. Thomsen, K. Verner were leading figures. A particular hypothesis about regularity in linguistic change had been borne out by abundant and coherent evidence, and had found its systematization in a scientific paradigm to which several of the human sciences - philology, history and psychology - had contributed.

The concentration of scholarly resources on certain areas of morphological and phonological fact had indeed altered markedly the positional value of philology among these sciences ('comparative philology' coming to seem, for better or for worse, the philological discipline par excellence). The adoption of closely stated methodological canons of observation and reconstruction underpinned a claim to an enhanced place among the historical sciences (a place that in the event has never been unreservedly accorded). Finally, with the resolution or suspension of certain conflicts - 'analogy' being recognised as a shaping force alongside the regular patterns of sound change, and a balance being achieved in the scholarly debate between proponents of physiological and psychological hypotheses - there was forged an association with a strain of positivist mentalism in psychology (soon, unfortunately, superseded within psychology itself).

This balance of disciplines did not prove equally rewarding when applied to other branches of linguistics (e.g., historical semantics). Its value as a legacy within the subject was therefore as mixed as the reception it was accorded by the educated public at large, by compilers of encyclopaedic views of knowledge, and by intellectual (of whom the philologist turned philosopher, F. Nietzsche, is a key witness).

For developments, therefore, German linguistics has had to look not only to refinements of this paradigm, but also to continuities from older traditions or to the emergence of new paradigms. Thus lexicography stands in a tradition going back beyond the Grimms, and even their historical lexicography belongs in its foundations and intellectual temper to the pre-Brugmann era. Grammar (never as fully slanted by 'historical grammar' as the broader science of philology had been by its comparative namesake) remained a synchronic, if not descriptive, study because of the continued need in schools for handbooks.

On the other hand, grammar has now become a model instance of an area where internal traditions - 'field' and 'positional' theories, for instance, or a functionalism stemming from K. Bühler - have been supplemented or even supplanted by the reception of ideas from the wider fields of European and American linguistic thought. Thus the two alternative types of 'dependency' (e.g. J. Erben) and 'generative' (e.g. M. Bierwisch) grammars can be plentifully illustrated from German work.

Semantics, in turn, can serve as a case study of a branch of the science that recognised relatively early (mid-1920's) the emptiness of the balance of historicism and psychology and sought to find new and autonomous approaches: the 'word field' theory of J. Trier formed a focus for these hopes. Indeed, the general theoretical position in the 20's and 30's (but perhaps most particularly in semantics) can be explored as a case study of as yet unrealized potential. Advance here will depend on the development of a rich enough set of observational and descriptive resources, and of more differentiated frameworks for deriving relevant hypotheses about the embedding of semantic phenomena in social settings.

P A R T I C I P A N T S (speakers underlined)

Name, Position, Institution	A d d r e s s
ALLPRESS Mr. A. Lecturer in German, Thurrock Tech	Woodview, Grays, Essex RM 16 4YR
BAUER-SCHLICHTEGROLL Mrs. Sylvia Head, Lang.Dept., German Institute	51 Princes Gate, Exhibition Road London S.W. 7
BURCH Mr. Peter S.Lecturer in German, N.E.London Polytechnic	Dagenham, Essex RM8 2AS
BURNETT Mr. James T.M. S.Lecturer & Head of German Studies University of Strathclyde	77 Canniesburn Road, Bearsden, Glasgow G61 1HB
BUTLER Mr. C.S. Research Officer, U Nottingham	NG7 2RD
CRAM Mr. David F. Research Fellow, Polytechnic of Central London	309 Regent Street London W.1
CUBBIN Dr. G. UAL, U Cambridge	27 Collier Road Cambridge
DENISON Dr. Norman Director, Lang. Studies, L.S.E.	Houghton Street, Aldwych London W.C. 2
EISNER Dr. Otto Z. S.Lecturer in German, U Bradford	Little Horton La. Bradford 7
ENGELEN Dr. Bernhard Dozent, Pädag. Hochschule Heidelberg	Albert-Schweitzer-Str. 41 6803 Edingen
FLOOD Mr. John L. Lecturer in German, King's College	(Hon. Sec. of Conf. U.T.G.) Strand London WC 2R 2LS
FOWLER Mr. John R. Lecturer-in-charge of Lang.Laboratory, University College Swansea	Singleton Park Swansea, Glam.
FOX Mr. Anthony T.C. Lecturer in Linguistics, U Leeds	Department of Linguistics, University of Leeds, Leeds 2
FRENCH Mr. J.R. Pr.Lecturer in Linguistics, Portsmouth Poly	34 Gomer Lane, Gosport, Hampshire PO12 2SA
FRIEDMANN Mrs. D. Lecturer in French & German, N.E. London Polytechnic	121 Gordon Road, South Woodford London E. 18
GOMES DA COSTA Mr. Brian Head, Arts & Mod.Langs, N.E.London Polytechnic	Dagenham, Essex RM8 2AS
GÖTZE Mr. Lutz Goethe-Institut München	Moltkestr. 13 6800 Mannheim
HARTMANN Dr. R.R.K. Lecturer in Applied Ling., U Nottingham	NG7 2RD
HATHERALL Mr. G. Lecturer in German, Ealing Tech	St. Mary's Road London W5 5RF
IVINS Mr. G.P. Team Member, Schools Council German Project at York	Micklegate House, Micklegate YO1 1JZ
JAMES Mr. Carl Lecturer in Linguistics, U College of N. Wales, Bangor	U.C.N.W. Bangor, N. Wales
KUMMER Dr. Manfred Akad.Oberrat, U Bielefeld	Herforder Str. 45 4800 Bielefeld
LEITNER Mr. Gerhard Student, U Hamburg/S.O.A.S.	Festalozzistr. 32. 8500 Nürnberg
LUNT Miss Helen N. Research Information Officer CILT	State House, 63 High Holborn London W.C. 1
MARGETTS Dr. John Lecturer in German, U Liverpool	5 Glenluce Road L19 9BX
MARTIN Mr. G.D.C. Lecturer in German, U Strathclyde	Livingstone Tower, Richmond Street Glasgow C.1
MARTIN Mr. G.M. Lecturer in German, U Aberdeen	King's College, Aberdeen AB9 2UB
NEWMARK Mr. P.P. Head, Mod. Langs., Polytechnic of Central London	Red Lion Square London W.C.1

NEWTON Dr. Gerald Lecturer in German, U Sheffield	Department of Germanic Studies, University of Sheffield, S10 2TN
PANETH Miss Eva (Off.Rep.of A.T.G.) Head, Methods of Mod.Lang.Teaching, Goldsmith's College	47 Netherhall Gardens. London N.W. 3
PEPPER Mr. G. Christ's Hospital High School	17 Egerton Road, Lincoln
REIBEL Dr. David A. S.Lecturer in Ling., U York	Department of Language, York University Heslington, YO1 5DD
RIGELSFORD Mr. Michael Lecturer in Dutch, U Liverpool	P.O. Box 147 L69 3BX
ROOT Mr. A.C. Pr.Lecturer in German, Kingston Poly	Penrhyn Road, Kingston-on-Thames, Surrey
RUSSON Mr. L.J. formerly Winchester College	41 Hocombe Road, Chandler's Ford, Hants. SO5 1SP
SAGER Mr. J.C. S.Lecturer in Mod. Lang., U Salford	University of Salford, Salford 7
SEIDMANN Miss Gertrud Tutor in Educ., U Oxford	15 Norham Gardens OX2 6PY
SEIFFERT Dr. L. Lecturer in German, U Birmingham	P.O. Box 363, Birmingham B15 2TT
SILVESTER Mrs. L. Research Assistant, Portsmouth Poly	Hampshire Terrace, Portsmouth, Hants. PO1 2EG
STANFORTH Dr. A.W. Lecturer in German, U Newcastle	University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne NE1 7RU
STRAUCH Mr. R.O.U. Lecturer in Ling.& German, U York	Department of Language, York University Heslington, YO1 5DD
TENCH Mr. P.W. Lecturer, English & Lib.Studies, U.W.I.S.T.	57 Park Place, Cardiff CF1 3AT
THOMANECK Dr. Jürgen K.A. Lecturer in German, U Aberdeen	17 Elm Place Aberdeen
THOMAS Prof. Ursula German & Curriculum/Instruction, U Wisconsin	1123 Pocahontas Drive Madison, Wis. 53716 U.S.A.
TRIM Mr. J.L.M. Director, Linguistics, U Cambridge	Sidgwick Avenue CB3 9DA
TWADDELL Prof. em. W.F. Brown U	Providence, R.I. 02912 U.S.A.
UPWARD Mr. C. Lecturer in German, U of Aston	Gosta Green, Birmingham B4 7ET
WAHRIG Dr. Gerhard Dozent, U Mainz	Panoramaweg 8 6200 Wiesbaden
WATERS Mr. Donald Lecturer, U of Strathclyde	Livingstone Tower, Richmond Street Glasgow C. 1
WILKIE Mr. John R. Prof.Elect of German, U Leeds	Department of German, The University LS2 9JT
WIRTZ Miss Erika A. Lecturer, U Liverpool	4 St. Anne's Grove L17 6BL
WYDALL Mr. M.E. Royal Liberty School, Romford	24 Crow Green Lane, Pilgrims Hatch Brentwood, Essex
ZYDATISS Mr. Wolfgang Student, U Edinburgh	c/o Dept. of Linguistics 14 Buccleuch Place, Edinburgh 8
FRIED Dr. V. Reader in Applied Linguistics, Portsmouth Polytechnic	11 Sussex Place, Southsea, Hants. PO5 3EZ